



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,666	03/13/2000	John G. Aceti	SMI-13459pA	6745
21005	7590	06/18/2007	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			DABNEY, PHYLESHA LARVINIA	
530 VIRGINIA ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 9133				2614
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/18/2007	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/524,666	ACETI ET AL.
Period for Reply	Examiner	Art Unit
	Phylesha L. Dabney	2614
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
<p>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 		
Status		
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 December 2006</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>		
Disposition of Claims		
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-12, 14, 16-22, 25, 27-39, 41, 42, 44, 46-48, 50-54 and 58-63</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1, 4-8, 21 and 22</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>		
Application Papers		
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</p>		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p>1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p>3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p>		
<p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>		
Attachment(s)		
<p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/2/06</u></p>		
<p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 2,3,9-12,14,16-20,25,27-39,41,42,44,46-48,50-54 and 58-63.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the Petition decision granted on 14 May 2007 in which claims 1, 4-8, and 21-22 were elected.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Subspecies C (Figure 6) drawn to claims 1, 4-8, and 21-22 in the reply filed on 11 September 2006 (OIPE stamped 11 December 2006) is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Diethelm** (U.S. Patent No. 3,852,540), in view of **Voroba et al** (U.S. Patent No. 4,870,688).

Regarding claims 1, 6, and 8, Diethelm teaches a base unit (2), an earmold (1, 3) removable attached to the base unit, a retention mechanism (col. 3 lines 13-34), and the earmold adapted to contain a hearing aid component non-removably integrated within the earmold, the hearing aid component comprising at least one of a battery (7,8), a receiver (5), and hearing aid electronics.

Diethelm does not teach the type of material used for the earmold; however, it is known in the art, as evidenced by Voroba (30), to use soft, malleable, compliant material for the earmold to facilitate comfort to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the shell of Diethelm from a soft, malleable, compliant material to facilitate comfort to the user.

Neither Diethelm nor Voroba teaches the earmold having a shorter life than the base unit. However, it is known in the art to be able to replace the earmold portion within the life expectancy of the aid if the structure becomes compromised, i.e. brittle and torn, and improve comfort and hygienic concerns for the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to change the earmold of Diethelm in view of Voroba within the life expectancy of the aid for improved comfort and hygienic concerns.

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Diethelm and Voroba teaches a base unit (2), an earmold (1, 3) removable attached to the base unit, a retention mechanism (col. 3 lines 13-34), and the earmold comprising a battery (7, 8) and receiver (5). Diethelm does not teach the type of material used for the earmold; however, it is known in the art, as evidenced by Voroba (30), to use soft, malleable, compliant material for the earmold to facilitate comfort to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the shell of Diethelm from a soft, malleable, compliant material to facilitate comfort to the user.

Regarding claims 5 and 7, the combination of Diethelm and Voroba teaches a shell integrated with the earmold (1, 3) and housing the battery (8) and a receiver (5).

2. **Claim 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Diethelm** (U.S. Patent No. 3,852,540), in view of **Voroba** (U.S. Patent No. 4,870,688), and in view of **Baum** (U.S. Patent No. 2,487,038), and in further view of **Knudsen** (U.S. Patent No. 2,246,737)

Regarding claim 21, Diethelm teaches a base unit (2), an earmold (1, 3) comprising a battery (7, 8) and receiver (5), and a retention mechanism (col. 3 lines 13-34).

Diethelm does not teach the type of material used for the earmold; however, it is known in the art, as evidenced by Voroba (30), to use soft, malleable, compliant material for the earmold to facilitate comfort to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the shell of Diethelm from a soft, malleable, compliant material to facilitate comfort to the user.

Furthermore, the combination of Diethelm and Voroba does not teach the earmold having a flexible, mushroom shaped earmold tip. However, it is known in the art, as evidence by Baum (figs. 1-5), for an earmold tip to have horizontal flanges (Knudsen; 12) for tightly sealing the auditory canal to the outside, providing comfort to the user, and for simulating a mushroom shaped tip. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the flange(s) of Knudsen onto the earmold (Diethelm; 1, 3) of the combination of Diethelm and Voroba for tightly sealing the auditory canal to the outside and providing comfort to the user.

3. **Claim 22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Voroba** et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,870,688); in view of **Schroder** (U.S. Patent No. 4,736,430).

Regarding claim 22, Voroba teaches replacing a base unit of a hearing aid comprising the steps: providing a modular hearing aid (10) having a base unit (200) an earmold (30) and a

module component (70); releasing a securing mechanism (50, 52, 244, 246, 248); removing the base unit (200); discarding the base unit (col. 5, lines 23-52); placing a second base unit (col. 5 lines 23-27) onto the earmold; and attaching the securing mechanism (50, 52, 110, 112).

Voroba does not teach the securing mechanism capable of being released by a user without the use of a separate tool or instrument. Schroder teaches an alternate rotational connection means (col. 2 line 59 through col. 3 line 2) for securing two hearing aid modules together and making it easier to disconnect the two housings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the rotational connection means in the invention of Voroba as taught by Schroder to make the two housings easier to separate.

However, it is known in the art to be able to replace the earmold portion within the life expectancy of the aid if the structure becomes compromised, i.e. brittle and torn, and improve comfort and hygienic concerns for the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to change the earmold of Voroba in view of Schroder within the life expectancy of the aid for improved comfort and hygienic concerns.

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the Applicant's Arguments, the Applicant failed to pose arguments relative to paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 from the Final Office Action dated 23 February 2005 which addressed the above claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phylesha L. Dabney whose telephone number is 571-272-7494. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays 8:30-4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(703) 273-8300, for formal communications intended for entry and for informal or draft communications, please label "Proposed" or "Draft" when submitting an informal amendment.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

[Handwritten signature of Curtis Kuntz]

June 10, 2007

PLD